



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/582,939	10/27/2000	Ulrik Pagh Schultz	P-5857	4543
7590 04/20/2004				
Michael L Kenaga Rudnick & Wolfe PO Box 64807 Chicago, IL 60664-0807		EXAMINER NAHAR, QAMRUN		
		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
		2124 15		

DATE MAILED: 04/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/582,939

Applicant(s)

SCHULTZ ET AL.

Examiner

Qamrun Nahar

Art Unit

2124

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 02 April 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]**

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_


Claim(s) rejected: 12-22

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_



Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant's arguments are not persuasive. For example, applicant argues that Siska fails to teach the "program language interpreter is adapted to determine whether a read code value corresponds to a standard type code (e.g. non compacted code) or to a specific type code (e.g. compacted code)". Examiner's Response: See Figure 4, "NEW COMPRESSED PROGRAM", where there is compacted parts and non compacted parts. Lines 1 and 2 of the NEW COMPRESSED PROGRAM is the non compacted parts, and Lines 3 and 5 of the NEW COMPRESSED PROGRAM is the compacted parts. Column 10, lines 66-67 to column 11, lines 1-22 describes the compression method of Siska. Column 11, lines 57-67 to column 12, lines 1-67 and Fig. 5B describes Siska's processor run of a NEW COMPRESSED PROGRAM. Furthermore, applicant asserts on pg. 8, par. 3 of the remarks/arguments that the "Examiner seems to make this assertion on the basis of a personal deduction as applicants are unable to identify any such embodiment from the disclosure of Siska. Therefore, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide an affidavit in accordance with 37 CFR 104(d)(2)." Examiner's Response: As previously pointed out in Paper No. 10, pg. 13, lines 1-5, Siska discloses a program language interpreter, see column 11, lines 57-67 to column 12, lines 1-67 and Fig. 5B. That is, Siska does disclose the functionality of the applicant's program language interpreter. The processor of Siska discloses the functionality of the applicant's program language interpreter. The processor is adapted to determine whether a read code value corresponds to a standard type code (e.g. non compacted code) or to a specific type code (e.g. compacted code). Anticipation does not require an ipsissimis verbis test, i.e., identity of terminology is not required. In re Bond, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Furthermore, since the Examiner is not making this assertion on the basis of a personal deduction, an affidavit in accordance with 37 CFR 104(d)(2) will not be provided.



**TODD INGBERG**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**